P.F. 32/97

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1894-95

191 .

(L. R.)

File No. 89/94.

Serial Nos. 1-20

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—20.

Major **Part B for** December 1897

SUBJECT.

Abone a grant of a building site to Rajalingam Hanumappa Devanahalli Tq.

Cla 99

Countermarked Mark.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000—28-1-19

Entered BBE

Petn No 106 of 1896-97
Petn No 154 of 1897-98 - Rem'd

The Title is not here - if
necessary, it will be
sent for -

Extract furnished from the Notices on our office -

During the Jama-
bandi of 1893-94 the
Kulkarni Kaidu
instructed the Ryot in
question to com-
-mence with the Survey
As there were two
applicants for the
Site, he ordered it to
be kept by Section
Du [illegible] Ryot of this
& of the Shekdari
Report, the Kaidu
on 10/1/94 Reported
that neither was ordered
Khan Bahadur
disturbing the Possession
of the Ryot Bhimaji Hanmant
-ient Ryot Hanmant
at one area a
Gunta yard - Bin 16/1/94
the Collector Refer Petitioner
against this to his
Petition to the Khan Bahadur
Kaidu Kaidu whom

with the act of the Chief
& Council, values
the work done by Rev
at No 23 - 11 - " - the
apartment (dry & Rock)
comes in this -

The late annual
Ceremonies Rejoicing
ton & other Duties
have gone back &
the District of Nice
The order of Govt
& says nothing about it.
the Rebirth - 19 - 7 - 96

(24)

Send for records & ask
Mr Hawthorn the builder
Sd not be found
No 23 called deliberately
for his unauthorised
proceedings +
the Asst found
to Potter as
Compensation —
If he asks for more
he has his Remedy
against the
Builder

20/7/96

Det/ Let forward
21-7-96

The same date directed the American Consul to order of the 10th. This reached the American on the 15th - 5 days 10 days before the date of delivery of Mapleson under the American order of the 10th. The American passed to Mr Vivian his order for Mapleson to proceed giving effect but - On another Petition from the Counter Petn, Mr/K. Vacated that another order to the American stood.

Mr Mutale Mr/K. Vacated Mapleson's Memo to the Supreme Court on 7-8-94 cancelled the grant made to Petn - Hence the appeal which was dismissed by Court (24 & 25th Jan) after hearing both Parties -

The present American

Memo

referred to in order
by the Commander
Officer Mediterranean
Station be given
Master of Merchant
Vessels - by
Proclamation dated
(17-1-94) the Right
Hon. Earl Russell of
Kingston Russell
Dorset Baronet G.C.B.
Her Britannic Majesty's
Envoy Extraordinary
& Plenipotentiary for
all respect Naval -

Note. Mention the
Merchant Vessels
the 8th Nov Radcliffe
Majesty's Letters
of the 1st Nov
& Merchant Vessels
the 17th, Instructions
referred to in
Naval Order dated
Oct 1894 by Admiral
Rear Admiral Hon

that the said orders
of the Queen in Council.
the Ld Lieutenants instead
of to any one of them

The Archbishop of
Canterbury & the Bishop of
London & the Bishop of
St. -

The Speaker announced
to the House that
the Lord Chancellor
had received the Royal
Assent by Letters
Patent to several Bills.

On another petition
of the Duke of Somerset
against the election
of Lord Hertford
for Totnes the Duke of
Somerset was heard
by Counsel in support
of his petition & the
Counsel for the Sitting
Member was heard
in support of the
Return & the Counsel
for the Petitioner
replied

26-1-4

Перед ним стоял
в. т. Пилипчук
. Сам же ничего не
мог понять
и не знал
что ему
делать
Он сел
и задумался
Пилипчук
и Кашкаров
ушли
Через
час
Пилипчук
вернулся
один
Он
сказал
что
Кашкаров
ушел
домой
Он был
очень
расстроен
Пилипчук

of the sale of land
belonging to Thomas
Green in the petition
there is no allegation
that a sale by auction
had been ordered.

On the 2nd date, the
C. Division ordered
the sale of the land
by auction, & took
the recognizance [illegible]
for carrying it into
effect by auction
sale [illegible]
directed to the Jer-
-sonville institution.
It is not ordered
that a reference to
the Master shall by auction,
direct a sale.

On the 17th Nov 1843, the amount
reported in 10/12/94
that he had sold
the land by auc-

definite a position that a call by public meeting had been considered at the ~~[illegible]~~ Local Election.

The subsequent correspondence results in the enrolment of the Hall by the Dog Tower.

We understand that the Optic Tower ~~[illegible]~~ ordered him to call the Land by auction, we have the power of the Rent by him to Examination.

The Optic Tower agrees that at the time of Election the Auction was verbally given to understand that the Rent of the Room by Public auction.

Yours Obedient
Your Obedient Servt.

has violated provisions
of the Constitution &
which the earlier
petitions & correspon-
-dence make reasonable
-ism that remain
the following facts

(1) The Petitioner
was not in favour of
the grant of Parliament &
Communities

(2) The application
had directed the case
to be decided upon
the facts & given to two
separate individuals

(3) The order of 20/1/94
quashed the decision
& remitted the application
for reconsideration

(4) The order of 7/1/94
directed the Secretary
of State to consider
& recall his order
of 20/1/94 which was
subsequently altered
with the 28th day

marks for me since
then (with the
exception of one letter
to Edith - Rejoice
that which by the Hand
principally of his
Palace.

The first [illegible]
dated 7/8/94, contains
almost entirely the
following

"Write it in the
middle of the night.
I had not told you
that I am going
tomorrow. I had
asked you to make
no plans - but
it has been impossible
to write sooner -
I left Paris
[illegible] [illegible]
& it has been [illegible]
to write [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

14

Appeal № 17 of 1894-95.

Appellant-
Hanumappa

Respondent:
Dodda Ranjappa

Appeal regarding a building site in Yaliyur, Devanhalli Taluk.

List of English papers.

(1) Jamabandi Officer's Memo with the Deputy-Commr's order thereon. ×
(2) Appeal petition
(3) Chief Secy's docket-to-Dy Comr directing stay of sale.
(4) Deputy-Commr's docket:
(5) Official Memorandum
(6) Dodda Ranjappa's petition

The grant is said to have
been made in express violat
of the express orders of the Govt
and the Dy Comr further
says that the grant is
fraudulent. Under these
circs Govt decline to
entertain it necessary
call upon the Dy Comr
to obtain & forward
explanation of his conduc
and submit it for the
of Govt. 12-10-95

3/

13

Ent. to Petition
the records & Brown
25/12/97 Sgt. Joseph
Asst. 29.12.97

His incapacity
in any other
any further action
in this matter.

20/12/97

21/12/97 Ent. to Petit.
Please Endorse of the order
for payment of the order

Ent. to Secretary
21/12/97

Petitioner
Petitioner's Solicitor

Petitioner's Solicitor has not received
the Petitioner's
or that the Petitioner
has subsequently
received payment
and withdrawn
the Petition

Petitioner's Solicitor has not received
the Petitioner's
or that the Petitioner
has subsequently
received payment
and withdrawn
the Petition

(5) Having regard
to the Petitioner's
age and general
health, there is
no need for
any further order
to be made in
the matter.

(6) The Petitioner
shall pay the costs
of and incidental
to the Petition
and of this order
to be taxed
by the Taxing
Master

C.

30-8-96.

Petitioner's Solicitor
Petitioner's Solicitor
Petitioner's Solicitor

14.12.97

Petitioner's Solicitor
17-12-97

17.12.97

No. 32

Name of Petitioner. Channappa

Village. Begur

Taluk. Devanhalli

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt 18-9-94

Date of Dispatch.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

by the petitioner, a few other villagers.
Chick Ranjappa & Doddahanjappa, out of spite against the petitioner applied for the same land on the 18th January 1892 and 11th October 1893. But the Amildar declined to give the land to them, as the petitioner was the first applicant.

5 That upon this, the other applicants moved the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District, by some representation or other in the absence of the petitioner, got an order herewith produced - Cancelling the purchase, and ordering the resale of the same land, without allowing even any Compensation to the Petitioner.

6. That the petitioner respectfully submits, that the order of the Deputy Commissioner is bad in Law and opposed to the natural justice, and dark shash Rules.

7 Your petitioner therefore most respectfully prays that the Government may be pleased to hear him and then



Bill
Pet

Promises
Stamp affixed

Before the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore

Re: his petition (1) of 3rd-9-94



The humble petition of Thimmaiah, Ryot residing at Yelagiri, Jemmenahally Taluq, most respectfully

Sheweth:-

1 That there is a Government waste land called in the village of Yelagiri, Jemmenahally Taluq.

2 That the petitioner desirous of building a house, to live in applied for the said land on the 23rd November 1891 and obtained the same in Inamdar from the government.

3 That since the inamdar, the petitioner has spent a large sum of money and built a house on the land and has been living in the same.

4. That long after the inamdar by the

Camp No. 204 of 7/10/94

Encl:

A.S. No. 17 of 94-95

Mysore Dewan's Office

Petition Department.

20

L.R. 89-94-2

Official Memorandum

The accompanying petition No 852, dated 18th ~~February~~ September 94 received at the Dewan's Office from Hanumappa of Yeleyur Devanhalli Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore cancelling the grant to Petitioner of a building site in Yeleyur, is forwarded, together with one enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, for submission of proceedings.

The Petition must be returned.

By Order

Draft

Chief Secretary

S.V. 7/10

then set aside the order
of the Deputy Commissioner
and confirm the proceed
of the said Petitioner;
and that pending the
disposal of this appeal
the order of the Deputy
Commissioner to resell
the land may be stayed

And your Petitioner shall ever pray

Attorney

Applicant

MYSORE

22 (4)

To the Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

Dated 1/11/54

No. Pet/587

L.R. 89-94-4

His docket No. 500 of 25th ultº.
Submitting proceedings relating to the appeal of Hanumappa of Yeliyur Devanhalli Taluk

---

With reference to the above has the honor to request that pending the disposal of the appeal, the order passed by the Dy. Comr. directing the sale of the Silks in question by auction may be stayed.

By order

Draft
Councilor

1/11/54

for Chief Secy.

1/11.

21

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

3797.

1894-95. Sept. 25.

From The Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To
The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 25th October 1894

Despatched 26th do

Received

Enclosures—No. 1 file.

General No.

D No. 500.

The Chief Secretary's No. C 204 dated 7th Instant, forwarding a petition from Hanumappa of Yelagur Devanhally Taluk, complaining about a building site in the village.

In returning the enclosures of the above, has the honor to submit the Proceedings called for

Dy Commissioner
Bangalore

Petition

Received 30-10

Submitted to the Council.

The proceedings contain a memorandum in English dated 2nd September recording the facts of the case. The petitioner appeared in English.

30/10

L.R. 89-94-3

Call for the petition and connected papers.

31/10

Perused the Dy. Commissioner's letter and the petition and the papers connected therewith.

2/11

(5)

818

Ag. 2/8 abstract is not forthcoming
27-8-95.

Receipt of Harrisonatha's
order, dated, 17th inst
Copy
852 of 94-95 (withdrawal
from Harrisonatha)
5/9 1175 dated 25-8-95
Plan last of Nov. 94
Harrisonatha of extent
Lease
L.R. 89-94-5
6/1
Repeat pattah
12/9.

Krishnaswamy's
The order & pattah applied in Nov last.
Plan see Harrisonatha's order. This shd have
been noted in the list & issued, as previous
orders passed were sent after pattah
issued & have been [illegible] of the matter
Plan & extent settled & subsequent order & the
Plan is also sent to - Pattah & plan issued
Receipt for Rs. 6/1 and paid, with the orders on back
& be forwarded after to Harrisonatha & handed
Harrisonatha's receipt for Rs. 6/1 paid - Receipt
& the Harrisonatha's Receipt

Received the 12th
Oct 95 at 10 A.M.
29/9/95

5 23 16/

Gen. Serial No. 327

1895

No. 878

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. Iyalipur

Taluk. Aliwalivalli

District. Vijayapuri

Date of Arzi. 20-8-95

Date of Receipt. 19-8-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 1

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

A.R. 84-94-6

12/11/94

6

Court Fee Stamp

Court Fee Stamp one Rupee Affixed — Refused

Court Fee Stamp

Court Fee Stamp

Court Fee Stamp

1175.

19 NOV. 94

By order

Under Secretary

No order on the back
Case on the file

852 of 194
Pet- Ex. in 194
5-87

2570

Draft
28/10

2. 89-94-7

840

27 1895 (7)

No. 494

Name of Petitioner, Hanumaiya

Village, Yelleyur

Taluk, Devanahally

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi, 12-10-95

Date of Receipt, 21-10-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

Revenue Appeal No 7
of 1894-95:

Pet- says that he is
illiterate, that he presents
the appeal through ~~his~~ his
Lawyer and that in spite of
the Endt given to him would
seek for an alternative either
allowing him to appoint a
Lawyer to plead for him
to consider the following:-
That the site in dispute was
bought by him (2) years ago

per sq yard; that he has built a house thereon at a cost of Rs 300 filling up the deep pits that existed there; that if the site is re-taken by Govt and sold in auction he would be ruined; that in the neighbouring villages sites are valued at from 3 pies to 6 pies per sq yard; that even in Devanahally sites have been given out at 6 pies per sq yd; and that considering the large amount which he has spent in building the house the Commr's order should be set aside

Prays that a lawyer may be allowed to plead for him.

BBh
26/10



Received
12.10.95
Court Fee
Affixed
Attached
to
Affidavit
Vakalath
Memo
Petition
to be
filed
10/12/95

Rs two Rupees Stamp affixed
14/12/10/95

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
DATE 24-10-95

Affidavit No. 105.
14.10.95.
1494
24/10

31 1896

No. 2441

Name of Petitioner, Ramanujam

Village, Ippaiyur

Taluk, Tiruchirapalli

District, Tanjore

Date of Argt, 15-10-96

Date of Receipt, 9-11-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, one

ABSTRACT.

LR 89-94-96

Petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent for the Consideration of an order passed by the 2nd & 3rd Councillors in Council reversed by the Hon'ble the Regent for disposal by endorsement.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor for orders.

HGL 22/2/96

Acknowledgment of the petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent that the order already passed cannot be reversed.

24/2/96

Submitted.

The receipt of the Superintendent of Tanjore Explanation of the Government Vakil has been called for - on the date calling for this, it is stated that the papers do not show any comment or record the matter (letter) mentioned against orders & Vakil's finally. The question raised by Petitioner is to be under consideration in connection with the similar explanation given by the above said may be given by the Superintendent & the matter is finally decided on receipt of the Explanation.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor HGL 25/2/96

Petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent for the Consideration of an order passed by the 2nd & 3rd Councillors in Council reversed by the Hon'ble the Regent for disposal by endorsement.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor for orders.

HGL 22/2/96

Acknowledgment of the petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent that the order already passed cannot be reversed.

24/2/96

Submitted.

The receipt of the Superintendent of Tanjore Explanation of the Government Vakil has been called for - on the date calling for this, it is stated that the papers do not show any comment or record the matter (letter) mentioned against orders & Vakil's finally. The question raised by Petitioner is to be under consideration in connection with the similar explanation given by the above said may be given by the Superintendent & the matter is finally decided on receipt of the Explanation.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor HGL 25/2/96

Petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent for the Consideration of an order passed by the 2nd & 3rd Councillors in Council reversed by the Hon'ble the Regent for disposal by endorsement.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor for orders.

HGL 22/2/96

Acknowledgment of the petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent that the order already passed cannot be reversed.

24/2/96

Submitted.

The receipt of the Superintendent of Tanjore Explanation of the Government Vakil has been called for - on the date calling for this, it is stated that the papers do not show any comment or record the matter (letter) mentioned against orders & Vakil's finally. The question raised by Petitioner is to be under consideration in connection with the similar explanation given by the above said may be given by the Superintendent & the matter is finally decided on receipt of the Explanation.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor HGL 25/2/96

Petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent for the Consideration of an order passed by the 2nd & 3rd Councillors in Council reversed by the Hon'ble the Regent for disposal by endorsement.

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor for orders.

HGL 22/2/96

Acknowledgment of the petn addressed to the Hon'ble the Regent that the order already passed cannot be reversed.

24/2/96

are put.

15/1

Subs

The case has been adjourned and the petr informed vide No. 852/1494 dated 24-10-95, on 10-95 subsequent to the date this petn.

This may be filed.

8/1/96

But the Pet[r] & appeals against the decision of the Council. How did he know of it before the end[t] reached him? Please explain. HBh

17/2/96

Though the court was issued to petr on 31-10-95, the petr seems to have seen the decision before the decision was pronounced in Council on 12-10-95.

17/2/96

Submitted to the 2nd Bench. Put up an English abstract for Hon'ble HBh 21/2/96 Attended to 22/2 HK

B 1472

1371 33

189 (9)

No. 2441

Name of Petitioner, [illegible]

Village, [illegible]

Taluk, [illegible]

District, [illegible]

Date of Arzi, 18 · 10 · 95

Date of Receipt, 9 · 1 · 96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, [illegible]

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

Die Mitglieder zogen sich an.
Die Mitglieder - die Familien
Die Familien - Die Familien
Die Familien hat Mitglieder
Die Familien hat Mitglieder
Die Familien hat Mitglieder

2

3

4

~ Ba. 88

38 (10)

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

L.R 89-94-9

Read:—

(1) Petition No 852 dated 18th September 1894, presented by Nanjappa of Yalagur in the Sirsi Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Bangalore, dated 7th August-94, cancelling the grant to Petitioner of a building site at Yalagur made by the Amildar, Srinivasa Rao.

(2) Record received with docket No 500 dated 25th October 1894, from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District.

Order thereon. 4030. Pt 94

24-10-94
31.

The grant to Amildar

Since Pet: file
is furnished.

Draft

By Order

Revenue Secretary.

to have been made in violation of the express order of the Assistant Commissioner, and the Deputy Commissioner further says that the grant is fraudulent. Under these circumstances, the Government decline to interfere, but deem it necessary to call upon the Deputy Commissioner to obtain Srinivasa Rao's explanation of his conduct and submit it for the orders of Government.

Draft
C243

24-10-95
Revenue Secretary.

To
The Deputy Commr
Bangalore District
with records.

Rep/o

21/10

Issued
19 Draft

Gen. 31.]

1895

L.R. 89-94-11

From

The Revenue Secretary

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 4th November 1895

Despatched

Received

General No. 4343
R. No. 981

Enclosure No. one Inward.

With reference to the records relating to the petition of Hanumappa of Yeliyur, Devanhally Taluk, regarding a building site in the said village, returned with this office Proceedings No. 4030 Pet. 840 dated 24th October 1895, has the honor to forward herewith

901

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 5057
R. No. 3447
7 JAN
DIWAN'S OFFICE

Gen. Serial No. 31.

1895. Pet 472

44

From
The Commissioner
Bangalore District

To
(13)
Rev:
The Secretary to the Govt.
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 25th Decr 95

Despatched 28th Do

Received

Enclosures—No. 1 & a file

General No.
D No. 5-94

The Government Proceedings
No. 4030 dated 24th
Pet. 840
October last, anent the grant of a building site at Yelagur, Devanahalli Taluk, to one Hanumappa.

In returning the enclosures of the above, I have the honor to submit the explanation of Sreenivasa Rao, in the matter.

Commissioner

Rev
Def
30/12/95

L.R. 89-94-12

are put up.

to be transferred
Peshkar
21/1/96

with references.

Submitted to the
Rev. Secy
in ~~Councillor~~.
22/1/96

Put up 3rd question
with order of
2-1-95
23-1-96

The papers dealing
with the matter finally

HHa

See Mr. Kufuna
Nanden's memo.
He says that he
told Mr Amir Walli
Landlord auction.
Kalpesh Amin. Ra
must be asked
? late when sho
then he states
his order of 26-1
reached the Amir
the land was
in Kutch.
order is of 10.1.
should require
. adoption by
- Sawani Nanden
It is said
Hormazdiar has
hands also - Is
What is the
of the mandwalla
marked. how
in the - Landlo
Limits?
As regards
must be called
other than Pet

26.1.90

Mr Bhaveshbhai

27-1-90

RD 30.1.
Nanden

herewith, for information, a memorandum showing the discrepancies and omissions noticed, on a comparison of the Inventory attached to the file, with the papers in the file.

By order

5-11-91

Revenue Secretary

Re-Dft.

6-11-95

4/11

(17)

Submitted 4/3

No note of that fact was made as the Petn was submitted with complete references without any note as to facts.

4/3 A clear statement as to how the matter really stand ~~as~~ must have been made.

Counsel desires Bn to file after receipt of the ~~counter~~ explanation

3/3/96

Draft Reminder & Ltr 3/3

RD 4/3/96. 5. P.M.

draft 5/3/96

L.R. 89-94-13

215

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:

The records received with Bangalore Deputy Comm's docket No 594 dated 25th Dec 1895 regarding the grant of a building site at Gelliyar in the Devanhalli Taluk to one Hanumaiya.

Order thereon No. 1071 dated 31.12.96

Mr B. Coopoosawami Naidu 2d Gen. Assistant Bangalore Deputy says in his memo dated 10th July 1894 that he had told the Amildar to sell the land by auction. He must be asked to state when and how he told the Amildar to do so. He further to state that his order dated 26.1.94 had reached the Amildar before the land was put in possession of Hanumaiya, while the Amildar's order is dated

* Encl: one Verification.

The Papers do not enable Govt to decide the matter finally.

Dy Commissioners Office.
Bangalore District.
Dated 24th April 1896.

D No 1040.

Encs 1 & a file

28 R (M)

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore.
Rev and Genl Departments.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No 6999 A. 1371 dated 3rd February 1896, calling for further report regarding a building site at Yelisyur in the Devanhalli Taluk, given to one Hanumappa on Valuation, I have the honor to state that Mr Ruppusami Naidu issued verbal orders, on a date not exactly remembered, when he inspected the spot with the Amildar, to the effect that the site should be divided into two blocks and sold by public auction

2. This order reached the Amildar

on the 18th. January 1894, i.e. 10 days prior to making over the land to Hanumappa and Mr. Ruppusami Naidu opines that there was enough of time even then for the Amildar to recall his own order.

3. The order dated 26th. January 1896 alluded to in the Proceedings under reply was issued subsequent to that dated 16th. January 1894 on another petition of Doddanjiah marked C. 1894

4. Hanumappa has other houses in the village as below:-

1. house - 18. Ankanams (roofed)
3. Ankanams (thatched)

1. house - 35. Ankanams (roofed)
9. Ankanams (thatched)

1. Palu Vataram in the name of his Nephew living with him.

5. The value of mud wall and other materials on the land is Estimated by a Punchayet and the

10-1-96. This point also requires Elucidation by Mr. Coopaswami naidu.

It is said that Hanumappa has other houses also. Should he has such houses and what is the value of the ~~thatched~~ mud wall & thatched roof hut ~~building~~ on the land in dispute?

2 The records connected with the case including Mr. Coopaswami Naidu's memo above referred to are forwarded to the Deputy Commr. for reference and resubmission with an Early report on all the above mentioned points.

(draft)

For Rev. Secretary

BCh 31-1-96

3/2/96

To
The Dy Commr Bangalore

95/96 F.R. 2400

52 file.

Memo No 826

In returning herewith Dft Commrs Memo No 2274 dated 13th February/96 and subsequent reminder No 2625 dated 11th March/96 regarding the grant of a building site at Peliyoor in the Devikulam Taluk to one Shanmugha Nadar to submit report No 245 dated 1st April/96 from the Asst Collr for information

During my Jamabandi of the Taluk in 1893-94 at the time of inspection of villages the site in question was inspected by the undersigned in company with the Asst Collr. At this time the applicant was verbally directed to devide the site into 2 blocks and sell them by public auction. This was prior to the order of the Asst Collr & the sheristadar. The exact date of the order cannot at this distance of time be quoted. The fact that the site was inspected is evident by the order No 15 dated 10.1.94 marked A from the Taluk

to the Samul-Sheikdar. The fact that the site was ordered to be divided into 2 blocks is also evident from the petition marked B of Dodamanjipah dated 16th January 94. On this petition the auditor was informed that it was contrary to the rules to give the Land on valuation and that if he had given it out he was directed to submit the record of the case with his report. This order dated 16.1.94 reached the auditor on the 18th idem that is 10 days previous to the site was put in possession of Hammappa by the Samul-Sheikdar. Thus it will be seen that the auditor had sufficient time to recall his order and obtain the undersigned order submitting the entire record. This the auditor failed to do. He, on the contrary, ordered the land was ordered to be sold as that there were more than one applicants for the Samul.

This office order of 26-1-94 quoted in the proceedings under reference was opposed subsequent to the order of 16.1.94 and was opposed on another petition of Dodamanjah marked C. The Samul-Sheikdar in his report

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 8129
No. 5672
20 APR 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Rev. Secl Department.

Dated 24th April 1896

Despatched 25th -

Received

Enclosures No. 1 a file

General No.
D No. 1040.

In reply to Govt No. 6999 dt 3rd February 96 P. 1371

SUBJECT.

Submitting further report
Re a brick & tile factory
in the Devanhalli
Kasba given to one Hanu
Mappa on valuation

Submitted
G
5-5-

Submitted with reference to Govt proceedings No: 4030 dt 24/10/95 and Govt proceedings No: 6999 dt 3/2/96 and the 2nd Councillor's note on file No: 2441

A.S
7/5/96
Rec
10.5.96.

S-5-96

L.R. 89-96-14

Rec
30.4.96

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

The reference relating to Retn Branch.
7/5 to be transferred to Retn Br
Retn Br 11/5/96

Present Amildar at about Rs 23-11-

Mr. Ruthnasami Pandia's English memo.
is attached with the Vernacular records.
At his instance attention is invited
to the flippant tone and language
of the late Devanhalli Amildar
in paras 2 and 3 of his report dated
8th December 1895.

Secretary
3rd

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant.

M Kumara Rao
Dy Commissioner

Rc 15 dated 8.1.99 marked D & Exhibit that Hammanippah possesses more houses than one and that the object of Hammanippah and others will be to do nothing in asking for the site was to secure manure accumulated in the pit. Besides this the sheikdom has stated in his report that the site should be given to houseless poor people in preference to Hammanippah and other well to do persons. Notwithstanding all these the authorities granted the site to Hammanippah.

After the receipt of the proceedings in reference the present Auditor was asked to report on value of the mud wall and thatched roof on the site. He has reported as follows after inspection. That he has seen the mud wall and the thatched roof. & putting the value of the same received from the Samal. sheikdom is enclosed. Hammanippa says that he has spent Rs 699 over fifteen & pies six for the mud wall &c. The counter petitioner says that the estimate of the sheikdom is exhorbitant. The petitioner has filed exhibit

with 1¼ feet mud & a small
culvert. Besides this he has fixed
16 stone pillars and placed over
them pieces of jungle wood of
very little or no value. The Estimate
of R, 23-11- a sum which can appear
to be correct and reasonable. It
is neither exhorbitant as stated
by Babu Nanjiya nor undervalued
as stated by Hanumappa. The
latter has filled the pit with 8
or ten cart-load of mud which
might have not costed him much
as he is a farmer and owns a cart.

The wording of the late
amildar of Devanhally in his
explanation requires to be noticed.

Recd 6
9.1.90

B Boothroosamah
2d Lieut Asstt Comt

(20)

I have read them both
and adhere to the opinion
that the granting of the land
to Hanumappa was irregular
and that it was properly
Cancelled by the Dy Com^r.

Regarding the conduct
of the Amt which was said
to have been fraudulent I
consider have, after careful
consideration come to the con-
clusion that it was highly
irregular and arbitrary - the
Asst Com^r Kuppuswami Naidu
is ~~guilty~~ that the same verbal
guilty positive, instructions verbally
not to give the land to
Hanumappa alone and that

This reason does not at all affect
this case as Hammabber is
said to own many other horses.
On the whole the Am. Sienega
Row has rendered himself
liable to the severe censure
of Govt by his unsatisfactory
conduct in this case - ~~The~~
~~but of this explanation is~~
~~also objectionable.~~ ~~and that~~
~~it would be~~ ~~I should be~~
~~warranted by~~ ~~to write more~~
~~those letters~~ the effect of
which has been subdued
by the disrespectful and
unwarranted language
he has made use of
~~in his explanation when~~
~~referred~~ in reference
to the Kuhn Samm raids.

Draft ordered. 10/5/96 WMB

he did so is borne out by the allegations contained in the letter of Doddanarayaba of 16th Jan 1894 - On this also the Agent Sonnenmarked that the granting of the land on fair valuation was not in accordance with rules. ~~and~~ This order reached the Board quite in time to enable him to withdraw from the contract he had taken. But he has ~~acted~~ acted and the reasons which he says guided his action in making the grant on fair valuation was to prevent unfair competition by well to do people Agt many rayts

62

Coppoosawmy Naidu is positive that he gave verbal instructions not to give the land to Hanumappa alone. That he did so is borne out by the allegations contained in the petition of Doddanarayappa dated 16th January 1894. On this also the Asstt. Collector remarked that the granting of the land on a fair valuation was not in accordance with rules. This order reached the amildar quite in time to enable him to withdraw from the position he had taken. But he persisted, and the reasons which, he says, guided his action in making the grant on fair valuation was to prevent unfair competition by well-to-do people against needy ryots. This reason does not

not at all apply to this case, as Hanumappa is said to own many other houses. On the whole, Amildar Srinivasa Row has rendered himself liable to the severe censure of Govt., by his unsatisfactory conduct in this case, the effect of which has been enhanced by the disrespectful and unwarranted language he has made use of ~~in his explanation~~ in reference to Mr. Coopoosawmy Naick.

Draft sent for approval

C.J. 22/5
For Secy.

To The Dy. Comm:
Bangalore Dt.
with records.

" Dy. Comm. Mysore Dt. for information & communication to Amildar Srinivasa Rao.

Draft sent for approval
Sd/- 19/5

Sd/- 19/5

Proc. of the Govt. of Madras.

(21)

60

L.R. 89-94-15

Read:-

Letter No. 1716 dated 24th April 1895 from the Asst. Commissioner, Cuddalore Division, forwarding with his remarks, with reference to Government Proceedings No. 5999/P.1371 dated 3rd August 1876, a memorandum submitted by the Assistant Commissioner B. Cothpoo-Sawmi Naidu, explaining the points noticed in regard to the grant by Kandlar of S.R. Srinivasa Row, of a building site at Veli-yur, Devanhalli Taluk to one Hanumappa, against the orders of the Assistant Commissioner, which grant was challenged by the Deputy Commissioner as fraudulent and Cancelled by him.

Read again:-

1. Proceedings of Govt. No. 4030/P840 dated 24th October 1895

1895, declining to interfere with the ~~Confirmation~~ Cancellation of the grant and calling for the explanation of the Amildar.

(2) The explanation sent with docket No. 594 dated 25th December 1895 from the Dy. Commr. Bangalore District.

Order thereon:- No. 102504/26-2916. dt 22-5-96 Sent Hdrs. file.

Government adhere to the opinion that the granting of the land to Kamanappa was irregular and that it was properly cancelled by the Deputy Commissioner.

2. Regarding the conduct of the Amildar which was said to have been fraudulent, Government have after careful consideration come to the conclusion that it was highly irregular and arbitrary.

For. Secretary to Govt.

61



No 261

Her Highness the Maharani Regent

1st Class

SECRETARIAT OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 1066 R.
DATE 7 JAN 96

Your Highness,

The humble memorial of Mra Iyengar, Devan Bahadur, most humbly Sheweth:—

1. That on the 23rd November 1891, he applied for a Government vacant site (a manure pit) in his village, for building purposes.

2. That the then Amildar Mr. Rama Rao made due enquiries in the matter, as the villagers refused to fill up the hollow and keep the site as an open ground, he ordered the disposal according to the rules.

3. That the matter however was postponed, till 1894, When Mr. Srinivasa Rao, the then Amildar inspected the land with the Sanitary Officer and finding that the same was in a very unclean condition and that its cleanliness was very essential, he directed its grant to the petitioner, as he was the first applicant, on the express condition that he should raise a building on it within 3 months.

4. That the petitioner was accordingly put in possession of the site on the 28th Jany 1894.

5. That the Petitioner then Commenced to build and fill up the pit at a considerable

outlay

outlay and even completed the building at a total cost of about Rs 500/- (5)

6. That after almost all the work was nearing completion, the Salem authorities interdicted the petitioner from proceeding with the work on the ground that the grant was fraudulent and should be cancelled

7. That this order of the Amildar has hurt the petitioner into a considerable loss and his appeal to the higher authorities and Government were however rejected. (vide final endorsement submitted)

8. That the petitioner as the last and only alternative hopes to throw himself at your Highness' feet and pray for justice. If the Revenue authorities acted fraudulently of which the petitioner knows nothing, it would not be just to sacrifice petitioner's interests. He has all along acted bona-fide, he applied in 1891. matter lay in correspondence till 1894, he was granted possession in January 94. on the express condition of building within 3 months, he did so, and whenever anything is wrong he is asked, & even then after the grant, to be ousted. Hence form the main features of the petitioner's grievances and he humbly entreats your Highness to peruse the records, and should his representations be real, order the cancellation of the order of ejection, confirm the land to him and thus support him and his family

For which act of kindness your petitioner will feel highly grateful

Your Highness
most obedient and
humble Servant

Bangalore
dated 23rd January [illegible]

Mark of Hanumaiah

64

(25)

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

L.R. 89-94-17

672 & 20/22 - 7-96.
Pet-1144-

I am the honor to request that the entire records relating to the grant of a building site at Yeliyur, Devanhalli Taluk, to one Hanumappa, against the order of Mr Sriniwasami Naidu Asst Commr, - herewith with Proceedings of Govt No 1025- L.R.D.C. dated 22nd May 1896 - may be retransmitted to this office as early as practicable for reference.

By order

Asst
Secretary

Secretary
Taluq responsible for
Petn & not accepting the acted
bona fide in building

Sdy R.d

Pet

Ref of references
Sdy S.C
7/7/1896

9666 Petitioner's Sd 24-9-96

4030 D 24-10-96

Pet 840

References are found

10/7 L.R. 89-96-96

2016

189

No. 176

Name of Petitioner, Thammanna

Village, Hesaraghatta

Taluq, Devanahalli

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi, 20 Sept 96

Date of Receipt, 7-10-96.

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 2.

ABSTRACT.

The Petitioner states that on 23rd November 1891 he applied for a vacant piece of land (a manure pit) in the above village & Sanctioned the then Amildar made enquiries regarding the villagers takarar and personally inspected the land - In 1896 the land was again inspected by Rev Sriniva Row the then Amildar in company with the Sanabundi officer & found that the cleanliness of the Shot place was very essential to

Pet 120 B96

L. R-89-94-19

1897

No. 154

Name of Petitioner Hanumappa

Village Yeleyuru

Taluk Devanhalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 13-7-97

Date of Receipt 14-7-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner states that the appe
to H. H. the Maharaja Regent
against the order of this office
directing the resale of the land
on which the Petitioner has
laid the foundation stones for
his house. He received Govt.
ment Rev 664 dated 31-3-96.
Subsequently he submitted a
reminder petition on 14-12-96
He received Endt. No 422.

He prays for orders on his
appeal petition

Reg
17/7/97

P06 of 96 (Rs. 672/144 geo.) -96 6-

Dy Comrs.) 20/7/97

Reference came put up for Genl Rs 1391 from DC Bangalore. Rs. 120/169 dt 18-8-96. (Grant of a building site at Yeleyuru to one Hanumappa) & submitted to Secretary on 28-8-96. as per entry in the Form Register.

AK 22/7/97.

Smith 22/7/97

* This may be done by the clerk himself under the orders of Secretary, if open work in the last Secretary's open has been prepared by him)

M 28/7/97

Subd

* papers quoted above is among the Secy's papers

Ber 6/7/97

Subd Secretary

M 26/7/97

V. Vacation - Petn may be disposed of on receipt thereof

28/7/97

he got granted the land to the
Petr no doubt the 1st applicant
Petr was put in possession
of the land on the 28th January
1894 - Six months after
the grant the Collector's
order was cancelled by the Govt
this time Petr had already
erected a building there
at a cost of Rs 500/-
On this appeal to Govt
he was given an Endorsement
stating that since the
land appeared to have been
fraudulently granted to him
Govt declined to interfere
in the matter -

Prays that on perusal of
the records an equitable
order may be passed cancelling
the order of ejection -

Oben.

7/7.

no. 106

L.R. 89-94-20

Prepare an enquiry in the prescribed form (the petitioner presented a Memorandum regarding)

30/12/97

Enquiry in the prescribed form submitted.

31/12/97

B. O.

73

for Secy.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy. Comr. Bangalore District together with the file received with his Dno. 169 of 18 August 1896.

B. O.

for Secy.

Submitted with reference to the Dewan's order of 20-7-96

Rec'd 27/8 Attended to. 28-8-96.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gen. No. 391
Rec. 120
19 AUG 96
1896-97
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Gen. 25½

From The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Rev. and Genl Departments.

Dated 18th August 1896.
Despatched 19th —— do ——
Received

General No.
Rev No. 169.
Enclosure No. 1 file

In reply to his docket
No 672 dated 22nd Ultimo,
P. 144
has the honor to re-transmit herewith the Vernacular correspondence relating to the grant of a building site at Yalagur, Devanhalli Taluk, to one Hanumappa

In Name
Dy Commissioner

Petition 182
19.8.96

Rec'd 26/8

Submitted with reference.
26/8

L.R 89-94-18

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 154 R
DATE 14-7-97

By post
14/7/97
154

71

Rep.
14/7/97

No.106 P

(26)

74

ಮುಜುರ್ ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಸಿರಸಿಕರ್ ತಿಮ್ಮಕ್ಕ ತಂದೆ ನರಸಿಂಹ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸಿರ್ಸಿ ಪರ್ಗಣೆ

ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಕಳಸಳ್ಳಿ ಗೆ ಯಿಂಡಾವ್ನ ಹುಕುಂ.

ಸಿರ್ಸಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕ್ಯಾದಗಿ ನಿವಾಸಿ ಸಿರಸಿಕರ್ ತಿಮ್ಮಕ್ಕ ತಂದೆ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಇವಳು ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ

ಕಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಪತ್ರ ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಮುಖಾರಾಸಿ ರೀಜಂಟುರವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿ

ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರುತವಾಗಿ, ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳ ಸತ್ಯಾಸತ್ಯತೆಯಿಂದ, ಈ ನಿಸ್ಪತ್ತಿ

ದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶವಾಡಲು ತಿರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿರುವದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಮುಖಾರಾಸಿ ರೀಜಂಟುರವರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ

ಆಂಶವನ್ನು ನಿಮಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮುಲಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ಬುಕಾರೀಕರು - 3 — ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಜೂನ — ೨೦

ಸ 1898 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಸೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು —

By Order,

for Secretary.

(816)

No 5975 / ಡಿ 32-ನ್ಯಾ 1.

Copy forwarded to the Dy (ಮುಖ್ಯ) Commissioner of Dharwar with reference to his letter No 169 dated 18/8/96